

REMARKS

I. Formalities

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that the Formal Drawings filed on November 28, 1998 have been accepted.

II. Status of the Application

By the present amendment, claims 5, 8, 12 and 14-15 have been amended and claims 18-28 are hereby added to more fully cover various implementations of the invention. Claims 2-28 are all the claims pending in the application, with claims 5, 7-8, 10-12 and 14 being in independent form. Claims 2, 3, 5, 8-9 and 12-17 have been rejected.

The present amendment addresses each point of objection and rejection raised by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 4, 7 and 10-11 are allowed.

IV. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 3, 5, 8, 9 and 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,011,976 to Michaels *et al.* (hereinafter "Michaels") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,608,637 to Beaton *et al.* (hereinafter "Beaton"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for *at least* the reasons set forth below.

A. Independent Claim 5

Independent claim 5 requires a combination of elements including:

...a telecommunication network with a first channel for voice transmission and a second channel for data transmission...

...wherein the terminal sends a message to the directory enquiry facility on the second channel indicating to the directory enquiry facility a request for further information.

Applicant submits that neither Michaels, Beaton, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests the feature that the terminal sends a message to the directory enquiry facility on the second channel indicating to the directory enquiry facility a request for further information, as recited in claim 5. Indeed, claim 5 plainly requires a first channel for voice transmission and a second channel for data transmission. To the contrary, as taught in Michaels, the communications terminal transmits only voice calls to network directory enquiries, which necessarily occur over “the first channel,” as recited in claim 5. However, Michaels provides no teaching or suggestion whatsoever that the communications terminal taught therein sends a message to the directory enquiry facility on the second channel (i.e., on the channel for data transmission) indicating to the directory enquiry facility a request for further information, as recited in claim 5.

Moreover, Beaton fails to cure the deficient teachings of Michaels. In fact, in providing reasons for the allowance of claims 7 and 10-11, the Examiner acknowledges that “the prior art of record failed to disclose or fairly suggest wherein a key is pressed on the key board of the

terminal it sends a message to the directory enquiry facility on the second channel, indicating to the directory enquiry facility a request for further information.”

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 5 is patentable over Michaels, Beaton, and any combination thereof, for *at least* these independent reasons. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent claims 2-3, 6 and 15-17 are allowable, *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

B. Independent Claim 8

Independent claim 8 requires a combination of elements including:

receiver means for... receiving on the second channel a message sent by the terminal indicating to the directory enquiry facility a request for further information...

In view of the similarity between these requirements and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 5, Applicant respectfully submits that analogous arguments to the arguments, set forth above, as to the patentability of independent claim 5 apply to claim 8. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 8 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above. Further, Applicant submits that the dependent claim 9 is allowable *at least* by virtue of its dependency on claim 8. Thus, the allowance of these claims is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

C. Independent Claim 12

Independent claim 12 requires a combination of elements including:

wherein the receiving module is configured to receive on the second channel a message sent by the terminal indicating to the directory enquiry facility a request for further information.

In view of the similarity between these requirements and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 5, Applicant respectfully submits that arguments analogous to the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 5 apply to claim 12. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above. Further, Applicant submits that the dependent claim 13 is allowable *at least* by virtue of its dependency on claim 12. Thus, the allowance of these claims is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

D. Independent Claim 14

Independent claim 14 requires a combination of elements including:

wherein the connecting module is configured to send a message to the directory enquiry facility on the second channel indicating to the directory enquiry facility a request for further information.

In view of the similarity between these requirements and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 5, Applicant respectfully submits that arguments analogous to the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 5 apply to claim 14. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 14 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above. Thus, the allowance of this claim is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

VI. New Claims

Claims 18, 20, 22, 24 are hereby added. Claims 18, 20, 22, 24 are fully supported *at least* by page 12, lines 9-12 of the originally-filed specification.

Claims 19, 21, 23, 25 are hereby added. Claims 19, 21, 23, 25 are fully supported *at least* by page 7, lines 23-27 of the originally-filed specification.

Claims 26 and 27 are hereby added. Claims 26 and 27 are fully supported *at least* by page 8, lines 12-27 of the originally-filed specification.

Claim 28 is hereby added. Claim 28 is fully supported *at least* by page 4, lines 9-15 of the originally-filed specification.

Claims 18-28 are respectfully submitted to be allowable *at least* by virtue of their dependency and for the recitations set forth therein.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Serial No. 09/199,230

Attorney Docket No.: Q51986

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER



Andrew J. Taska
Registration No. 54,666

Date: March 25, 2005